DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 394 FL 009 646

AUTHOR Ornstein, Jacob
TITLE Sociolinguistic Changes Viewed Within a Tagmemic Model.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Congress of Linguists (eleventh, Bologna-Florence, August 28-September 2, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grammar; Language Research; *Language Variation; *Linguistic Theory; *Models; Morphology (Languages); Phrase Structure; Sentence Structure; *Sociolinguistics; Structural Analysis; *Tagmemic Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how tagmemics can be equipped with a notational mechanism to account for significant variability phenomena in language. A brief history of variation theory is followed by a proposal for a tentative notational system for marking variants. An illustration of this system is provided through application to various levels of analysis: the clause, the phrase, and the word. (AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157394

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ELEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF LINGUISTS

BOLOGNA-FLORENCE, AUG. 28-SEPT. 2, 1972

Edited by

LUIGI HEILMANN
U. of Bologna
Istituto di Glottologia

I

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jacob Ornstein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Società editrice il Mulino Bologna

2

FL009646

SOCIOLINGUISTIC CHANGES VIEWED WITHIN A TAGMEMIC MODEL

JACOB ORNSTEIN

A. *Introductory Considerations.*

One of the most significant developments in recent linguistic history is the concern with language diversity, as the various models move away from the idealized "educated native speaker" as the exclusive source of corpuses for analysis [1]. This reflects a dual focus, through interest in both inter- and intra-linguistic variation and is obviously intimately related to the general problem of linguistic change, both internal and external. As the program of this very Congress reveals, the number of papers on questions of the above problem are remarkably high.

Ironically enough, although tagmemicists have been predominantly anthropological linguists, unusually close to multilingual contact points in a number of countries, they have concerned themselves very little with this area of research. Accordingly, our main preoccupation here is to investigate how, within its basic hierarchic-type framework, tagmemics can be equipped with a notational mechanism to account for significant variability phenomena.

In the interests of securing a sharper focus for our thesis, a brief background survey is offered of insights into variability by linguists and other theorists. This will be followed by a proposal for a tentative notational system for marking variants, and intended to be more programmatic than anything else. Finally, a limited number of examples at the clause, phrase and word levels will be considered and some implications drawn.

A few preliminary notes are needed here on the tagmemic model itself. As ought to be known, under the original name of "grammemics" or "gramemics" it developed, particularly under the influence of Pike, out of Bloomfieldian structural linguistics. As Newman (1968) has suggested, one of the main reasons for its relatively secondary position among models is that it emerged in the mid 1950's at a time when an unusually high number of theories were in competition and was all but swamped by this multiplicity. Another factor, it is conceivable, was that its emphasis on application led younger scholars to eschew it, preferring seemingly more abstruse and philosophic systems.

[1] Appreciation must be expressed to our University's Research Institute, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, Austin, Texas, and the Spencer Foundation of Chicago, all of which contributed materially to making possible our program of Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism, now under the Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center, whose corpus was utilized in this paper. Moreover, sincerest gratitude must also go to the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C. for the opportunity to prepare this study in greater depth than might have been possible without the Senior Fellowship awarded me for 1971-72. Individuals who made useful suggestions include: Glenn G. Gilbert, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Garland Bills, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; Jack S. Bailey, University of Texas, El Paso; and a number of others impossible to mention here.

Aside from the above, a genuine problem has existed in the tendency in some quarters either to ignore tagmemics altogether, or to regard it as an overy-mechanistic and static formulation, which has failed to keep in step with general intellectual developments. Fortunately, the facts would appear to point to the opposite. A series of lectures on the evolution of tagmemics, presented at the 1964 Linguistic Institute at Ann Arbor by Pike, was reworked into an inclusive, annotated bibliography by him (1966), presented from the trifold perspective of his notions of "particle, wave and field". Georgetown University's 18th Annual Round Table in 1967 was entirely devoted to recent developments. Refinements were advanced, for example, by Blansitt (1967), who proposed that the term "tagmeme" be used to subsume a group of related tagmas, costituting a redefinition of a concept whose parameters were threatening to become excessively broad.

As one views tagmemics today, it is certainly showing vigorous signs of joining the linguistic mainstream, with concern being shown for higher-level structures, including paragraph and discourse, as well as problems of surface versus deep structure and its analogs.

It is possible, in our opinion, to identify a half dozen distinct currents: (1) An attempt to merge Fillmore's case grammar with tagmemics, exemplified by the work of Cook (1969); (2) a cognitive model being elaborated by Blansitt (1972) based on phonology, grammar, and semology as the three hierarchies, bearing at least superficial resemblance to Lamb's stratification approach; (3) a generative tagmemic model followed by Longacre (1968, 1970), one of the most active and influential practicioners, and which is based on surface-to-surface transformations, as well as by Liêm (1966); (4) a formulation by Peter Fries (1971, 1972 and forthcoming), aiming at a more coherent and explicit theory of surface grammar for the purpose of developing new approaches to deep structure and semantics; (5) a "behavioristic" model, elaborated by Pike, focussing increasingly upon language and its relations to the sociocultural components of verbal production and the analysis of speech acts (1968). Moreover, Blansitt and Ornstein (1969), it might be noted, have compared the strong similarities between Harris's String Grammar and tagmemic analysis, a type of discussion becoming increasingly common these days as regards tagmemics vis-à-vis other models.

Several of the scholars mentioned above are indeed participants in this very Section of the present Congress. Individuals like Professor Pike, undoubtedly the most renouned tagmemicist in the entire world, will be able better than the speaker to interpret the latest developments in the continued evolution of this theoretical model toward ever greater versatility.

B. *Language Variation in Theoretical Linguistics and Cognate Fields: Background Notes.*

Space forbids anything but the most fleeting mention of the pioneers of language variation, some well known, others less so. For reviews of the subject, readers are referred to Haugen (1956 and forthcoming), Bailey (1970, 1972), and writings of such scholars as Weinreich (1953), Gumperz (1967, 1969), Fishman (1968, 1970) and Bernstein (1970).

The fact is that by now workers in quite varied fields, including sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, anthropology, dialectology, and pure linguistics, have converged upon the problems of the variability of language to an extent that appears unprecedented. Collections by Fishman (1968), Fishman, Ferguson and Das

Gupta (1968) and others unite the efforts of scholars in America, Europe, Asia and Africa in a way that is heartening, particularly because of understandable feelings that United States scholars have in the past several decades not given due recognition to the symbiotic contributions of colleagues in Europe and elsewhere abroad.

Truly, no one theoretical model has thus far existed which has been designed with a view to accounting for patterned variation in language. Paradoxically, however, neither do they, in general, *ipso facto*, exclude investigations of variability. The fact simply appears to have been that homogeneity of form, or homogeneity of surface realization, has preoccupied the attention of linguists rather than diversity.

The advent of Chomsky was at first not favorable to studies of linguistic divergence, since the former's concern was with standard, educated speech. Little more than a half decade ago (1965:3), he declared:

> "Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly ...".

In effect, however, the concern of the generative-transformational school with grammaticality and well-formedness has triggered interest with that portion of utterances in any language which are *not* acceptable for a variety of reasons. Likewise, the drives on poverty and the interest in "social dialects" have motivated linguistic scholars in recent years to investigate low-prestige vernaculars and varieties of language normally neglected in the past. (John and Horner, 1970; John, 1971).

One such linguist has been William A. Labov whose works are too well known to need belaboring here. A student of Weinreich, Labov set out to investigate the possibilities of viewing linguistic change in process, that is synchronically, and in so doing, brought forth strong evidence that language is inherently more variable than it is homogeneous, and that rather than being purely idiolectal or in free variation, it is ordered and rule-governed. Believing that, despite doctrinal differences, the Chomskian framework is still the most desirable, Labov has contributed several fundamental concepts to transformational-generative practice, which equip this model to deal with variation. As will be noted below, the "linguistic" or "sociolinguistic variable" has been extremely influential in providing a viable bridge between linguistic and social phenomena.

Labov rejects the idealized educated native speaker as the primary basis of linguistic study, advocating the analysis of vernacular samples elicited from small groups in as natural situations as possible, by peer group interviewers, if possible. A large number of measures are applied (many orally) including attitudinal probes. The systematic patterning of speech along the dual axes of socioeconomic status and style (casual speech, careful speech, reading word lists, minimal pairs) has been shown by him to have high correlatability with linguistic structures, so that the notions of « free variation » and « idiolect » are constantly under attack.

Although preferring the Chomskian framework, Labov has introduced two important concepts. One of these, particularly for the elicitation process, is the "sociolinguistic variable", as one correlating significantly with some non-linguistic variable of the social context, such as speaker, interlocutor, audience, setting, socioeconomic status, ethnic group, age and the like. Some linguistic features, which he calls "indicators" may be called "stratified" if they can be ordered hierarchically according to such social contexts as age or socioeconomic status. "Markers" are those sociolinguistic variables which are highly developed and which show both stylistic context and stylistic differentiation (Labov, 1970:66-67). At any rate, the

main point is that the *linguistic variable* has become a fundamental concept in its basic meaning of correlation of language and social dimension.

In order to cope with ordered variation, not accounted for in any of the linguistic models, Labov has introduced his notion of "variable" rule. A brief example will be given of how it functions (Labov 1970: 68-69).

A highly stigmatizing variable of American English is the realization of /dh/ or /th/ not as continuants but as stops, or /d/ and /t/ respectively. Labov accounts for it as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} +\text{cons} \\ -\text{voc} \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow ([-\text{cont}])/ \begin{bmatrix} -\text{strid} \\ -\text{back} \\ +\text{cor} \end{bmatrix}$$

The above, in fairly conventional Chomsky-Halle terms, has only the convention of the parenthesis around the right-hand member, to indicate the existence of a variable rule, which will automatically be understood to mean that $\varphi = 1 - k_o$, wherein φ determines the frequency or "chance" of the operation of the rule. This frequency is a function of both style and socioeconomic class, expressed in the following variable input:

$$k_o = f(\text{SEC, Style}) = a(\text{SEC}) + b(\text{Style}) + c$$

in which k_o signifies a sociolinguistic constraint, consisting of socioeconomic status (SEC) plus style, each of these remaining to be specified. In other words, φ (frequency of occurrence) $= 1 - k_o$.

Investigators of inner city, principally Black English, employing the Labovian model with modifications include: Shuy (Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley, 1968; 1970; Smith and Shuy, 1972), Wolfram (1969, 1971), Fasold (1969, 1970), Riley (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley, 1968), Taylor (1971), Baratz (1970), and Smith (Smith and Shuy, 1972) as well as his own associates (Labov, Cohen, Robins and Lewis, 1968). Of the above, most have had some connection with the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D. C. (They might conveniently be called the "D. C. School").

Charles-James Bailey (1970), in collaboration with Weinreich, Herzog and Labov (1968), has elaborated his "wave model" of speech variation in an attempt to accord much fuller recognition to the dimensions of time and space. He utilizes variants to demonstrate ongoing linguistic changes, by plotting the forms along vertical and horizontal cells in grids, according to their clustering by geographical area and the chronology of their change or maintenance.

As an emerging member of the post-generative generation, Bailey has repeatedly lashed out against unitary-type grammars, advocating instead "polylectal" or "panlectal" ones. (He uses *lect* and *isolect* rather than dialect.) Moreover, he insists they should embody both the diasynchronic and diachronic dimensions and also admit nonlinguistic data on the constraints of language usage to help explain the patterning of the variations (1971: 1-31). Relevant as well is the brief but instructive survey of the work of such generative semanticists as Karttunen, the Lakoff's, McCawley, Carden, Postal and Ross, as it relates to linguistic variation. Very importantly, moreover, he reviews the role in this area of outstanding European scholars, including Schuchardt, De Saussure, Meillet, Martinet, and Jakobson, who helped carry on the Prague School tradition in America.

Language variation is probed by a growing number of other scholars such as McDavid (1971), a social dialectologist, and Von Raffler Engel (1971; Von Raffler

Engel and Sigelman, 1971), who utilizes videotapes, sonographs and other sophisticated electronic equipment to arrive at a deeper supra-segmental level, in attempts to comprehend the sociolinguistic significance of such features as pause phenomena and kinesics and to correlate these.

Finally, more than ever today, inputs from other disciplines, particularly the social sciences, are being sought, to explain away many of the elusive unknowns in the areas of both linguistic variability and choice, long overdue when one considers the inadequacy of analyses based on language as an isolated phenomenon in its own microcosm, detached from any non-verbal context.

Fishman's formulations, through his prolific and insightful publications have gone far in helping achieve a symbiotic relationship between linguistics and the social sciences. His refinements on the domains of language use and choice, as well as his concept of "interactional sociolinguistics" (1970: 37-56) are fundamental in our literature. Hymes (1962, 1967), an anthropologist through his « ethnography of speaking" model, has been an energetic, influential catalyst to scholars in several disciplines interested in arriving at analyses of the speech setting paralleling the explicit descriptions of language output itself. Another anthropologist, Rubin (1968), has analyzed Guaraní-Spanish bilingualism in Paraguay as it interrelates with the four extra-linguistic variables of stability, usage, attitudes and acquisition coupled with proficiency.

Ervin-Tripp (1968), a psycholinguist, has conducted experiments on several types of bilinguals, aimed at revealing the intimate interaction of language, topic and listener, with important observations on apparent motivations for shifts of language and style. Coates (1967), a linguist, has developed a framework for analyzing speech acts, consisting of some fifteen criteria, at points where language intersects with its socio-behavioral settings.

Beyond this, new frontiers include the stimulating interaction in a framework above the explicit isolates of its verbal output, much of it covered by the term "ethnomethodology". Although such studies are still in their infancy (Goffman, 1972; Sacks, 1969; Schegloff, 1968; Mathiot, 1967 and forthcoming; and Garfinkel, 1968), their focus on the total conversational interactional situation, still too little understood today, appear promising for our particular topic here. Jakobovits, a psycholinguist, much concerned with the "syntax of conversational interaction", has drawn upon these scholars in his *Preliminaries to the Psychology of Ordinary Language* (1971).

Eventually, a better understanding, therefore, ought to result from all these efforts, of factors unexplainable in linguistic terms, which underlie much of variation in human speech and its realization.

Meanwhile, leaders in linguistic theory themselves, are approaching full circle, in concerning themselves with psychological and sociological phenomena left untouched for decades because of the inhibiting effects of Bloomfield's and Bloch's supposedly antimentalistic strictures. For example, Labov conceives of sociolinguistics as an unnecessary subdiscipline of the field, only useful as long as linguists refuse to embody a social component in their work. He submits (1970) that the study of language in its social context addresses itself to the same range of linguistic problems as other approaches to linguistic theory. These problems include seeking solutions to how rules are combined into systems, the ways in which they are ordered within these systems, how systems are related to each other in bilingual and polysystemic situations. Beyond this, there is a concern with how rules and rule systems change, and the relationship of such changes to language acquisition and the larger framework of linguistic evolution.

Returning now to tagmemics itself, it might be noted that almost a quarter cen-

tury ago Charles Fries and Pike (1949) conceived of the "coexistence of systems". A decade later, the latter in his article "Toward a Theory of Change and Bilingualism" (Pike, 1960), viewed the two languages spoken by the bilingual as contrastive systems, each of which constituted a "hypersystem", consisting of varying styles at the core and with the bilingual along the margins, yet functioning within a single culturo-linguistic matrix. Unfortunately, neither of these formulations was pursued and developed. Even Pike's own *magnum opus, Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (1968), issued in three parts in the 1950's, did not explicitly elaborate his concepts on language variation and change. Nevertheless, it is a highly provocative and detailed exegesis of behavioristic approach to tagmemics. It is both universalistic and etic and particularistic and emic, as it attempts to treat the different societies and subgroups throughout the world. Like Hymes, he tends to feel that human behavior can be as discreetly patterned in "structures" as the components of language, and as a significant development, still little practiced by tagmemicists themselves, he attempts to show in specific terms how formulas within this model may reflect variability. For example, in his analysis of behavior, an "S-tagmemic slot" could be a slot, position, or status (or status-slot) in some type of organized group of people. The immediate "filler" of the S-slot might then be Mr. John Doe, President of the Federal Bank in Jenkins City, who would represent the abstracted set of personal, professional, and supposedly special language-style characteristics of that status-class of Federal Bank Presidents (Pike, 1967: 647-9).

The fact is, nevertheless, that Pike's latest formulations are still, except for his school was not invited to share insights into how language variation would be indeed the role that tagmemics can play in studying language variation remains ill-defined. Meyerstein (1970), in reviewing the proceedings of the 1967 Second International Seminar on the Description and Measurement of Bilingualism, quotes Prof. Siertsema, one of the participants, who asks why Pike or a representative of his school was not invited to share insights into how language variation would be handled in a "unified theory of human behavior". In the remainder of this paper, we shall attempt to show how a fairly simple notational system could be utilized for the purpose of indicating the sociolinguistic status of the isolates of language output.

Perhaps the most appropriate framework for the study of variation would be within what Haugen (1971) has called "language ecology", defined by him as "the study of interactions between any given language and its environment", and noting that, "the true environment of a language is the society that uses it as one of its codes", he details ten ecological questions or issues which need to be asked about a given language or language variety and its relationships to the country where it is used and in fact, the entire universe. Among these is the question of what internal varieties a language shows, and in dialectological terms, what are the regional, social and contextual dialects?

Little more need be said here as evidence of the growing intensity of the interest in the inherent variability of language among linguists and scholars in related fields today.

C. *A Tentative Sociolinguistic Notational System.*

Our concern here is basically with a marking system which would provide more information on the sociolinguistic constraints upon the use of linguistic features or items than has been the case thus far, as a result of "unitary" attitudes

toward language. Almost by its very nature, it will be largely etic, and applicable to languages in general, although emic or language-particular markings are by no means out of the question.

To a certain extent, the problem has been approached indirectly many times before whenever judgments have been made regarding the appropriateness or acceptability of linguistic forms. Much of this, however, particularly among prescriptive grammarians and lexicographers has centered upon excluding all but formally sanctioned "elitist" choices.

More germane to the issue have been certain aspects of the work of sociolinguists. Ferguson (1962 a, 1962 b) has devised a scale for assessing the degree of standardization of languages while his diglossia concept establishes a High (H) vs. Low (L) dichotomy where two highly differentiated forms of the same language exist, as in Greece, one for formal and the other for informal domains (Ferguson, 1959). Stewart's revised scheme (1968), classifies languages and language varieties according to both their nature and function. His system is based on one-letter designations, such as *u* for "vernacular", *p* for "pidgin", *c* for "creole" *a* for "artificial" and the like.

Attempts to describe the various styles or codes within a given language have been made by Joos (1962) and others. Halliday (Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, 1964) speaks of language "registers", while Gumperz (1967) conceived of the "linguistic repertoire", which subsumes all styles controlled by a speaker. Labov divides all styles into: (1) careful, (2) casual, (3) reading, (4) word lists, with a fifth constituted by minimal pair reading, mainly used as are (3) and (4) in the elicitation process. Ivić has described a scale going from 0 to 100%, showing relative mastery of standard language vs. local dialect and which accounts to a certain extent for code-switching and similar factors (1966).

By far the most thorough review of systems attempting to characterize the position and functions of individual languages appears to be that of Haugen (1971), who further shows how one may use relevant sociolinguistic dimensions, utilizing the device of binary opposition. For instance, among certain Norwegian immigrants topics, occasions and persons would demand the use of English for prestige purposes, hence, this would be characterized as follows: [+status] and [−intimacy].

By contrast, presumably among the first generation, casual and intimate situations would require Norwegian, which would then be marked: [+intimacy] and [−status].

Returning for a moment to the theoretical dimensions of grammatical acceptability and its analog well-formedness, we are in danger of involving ourselves in speculations which will be of little benefit. Nevertheless, the supposition that even educated native speakers generate utterances of unquestionable acceptability appears not to be supported by facts. Labov (1970: 38) has experimented with a three-point scale in which 1 is ungrammatical, 2 is intermediate and 3 is perfectly grammatical, not finding an impressive degree of categorical agreement among his Subjects.

A considerable literature has by now accumulated in the work of other sociolinguists, psycholinguists and speech specialists on language attitudes, part of which touches upon standardness vs. non-standardness. This includes self-evaluation and classroom correction tests, again by Labov and associates (1968: 4), and similar attitudinal tests by Williams (1970).

Unfortunately, for most languages of the world, scientific surveys of language usage simply do not exist, and intuition still remains the most common criterion.

Various types of usage surveys are, however, to be noted in English and a

few other languages. Quirk and Svartvik in *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability* (1966) avoid questions of authoritativeness and merely approach the issue by applying "tests" in which respondents are required to indicate whether they accept a given item as appropriate or not.

Other studies include the British Survey of English, concerned mostly with grammar and one at Brown University, by now embracing about a million running occurrences of American English lexical items (Householder, 1969). A project leading to a Dictionary of American Regional English was undertaken some five years ago by Frederic G. Cassidy, University of Wisconsin, has through oral and written questionnaires, already canvassed over a thousand communities in this country. Dialect studies, of course, are also pertinent, and are reflecting an increasingly more sociolinguistic trend, but their results must be utilized with proper precautions.

An encouraging trend at present as regards the grammatical propriety is the tendency to regard data in the light of the linguistic continuum, whose significance has been constantly urged by Shuy and others, as we have noted above. In a recent Presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America, Hill took issue with the test of grammaticality as supreme arbiter and suggested that investigators like Quirk and Svartvik may be on safer ground by their exploration of the principle of gradience rather than a dichotomous polarity.

Lexicographers have begun to go beyond traditionally prescriptive academic auspices, turning to a variety of persons in communication fields. The compilers of the *American Heritage Dictionary*, for example, appointed committees of judges called Usage Panels to decide upon the most desirable or appropriate choices of lexical items through consensus (Bishop, 1969). Regarding "standardness", Hoss (1969) recognizes the relativity and tenuousness of the concept and in discussing variants, in the introduction to the dictionary, he in effect treats speech styles as a sociolinguistic dimension. No less is such an orientation reflected by the labelling system, which consists of the following: nonstandard or informal, slang, vulgar, obsolete, archaic, rare, poetic, regional, British, foreign language, and with more or less arbitrary variants introduced by "also".

For Spanish, as we have suggested above, the problems of assigning or assessing sociolinguistic status are in many ways much more thorny than for English. The "authoritativeness" of the Royal Spanish Academy, in Madrid, it is true, is often much more lip service than anything else, but nevertheless, it does constitute, as it were, a supreme arbiter for the prescriptive codes throughout the entire Spanish-speaking world. Aside from this, there is a network of national academies, passing upon usage within a given country, although the influence of these entities dare not be over-emphasized. For the best picture of the situation, and the often ambiguous interrelations, one may be referred to Guitarte and Torres (1968). It is, incidentally, interesting to note that in a recent dictionary of Bolivianisms (Fernández and Fernández, 1967), the appendix includes a list of lexical items approved by the Academy in Madrid, as well as another of vocabulary "not yet approved".

By way of parenthesis, let it be said that although the French Academy presents the image of probably the most authoritative arbiter of usage in the world, the fact is that the Spanish counterparts appear less prone to be liberal in the sense of publishing the periodic lists of permitted features called "tolérances", in recognition of the "informal authority" of widespread usage by all social classes. A case in point here would be the relaxation of the wellknown prescriptive rule calling for deletion of the indefinite article in negative partitive constructions, such as "je n'ai pas d*u* vin" rather than "je n'ai pas d*e* vin".

It remains a fact, however, that most of the Luso-Hispanic world lies heavily

under the prescriptive tradition, in which the influence of written "authorities" is still great, although a younger generation of scholars with modern training is emerging in Spain, Colombia, Peru, Mexico and Puerto Rico, as well as Portuguese-speaking Brazil. By contrast, a certain amount of attention both by scholarly and popular individuals and entities is being accorded the struggle against the English-language interference upon Spanish, lest a *Mischsprache* might result (known popularly as "Spanglish").

Furthermore, efforts to determine the status of variants are impeded by serious gaps in modern dialect research. Although the situation for Spain is probably the most favorable, that of Latin America is not, because of the vast territories to be covered, chronic financial difficulties, paucity of researchers with up-to-date training, and the like, so aptly described by Lope Blanch (1969), who is, moreover, particularly interesting for his discussion of "unity" and the "substratum theory" as regards Spanish throughout the world. Boyd-Bowman (1970) and García (1968) further supplement the description of the situation, with the latter characterizing the work of Navarro Tomás and other dialectologists as essentially prestructural. In a similar connection, Diebold (1962) in discussing Mexican and Guatemalan bilingualism, chooses to typify Spanish in those countries as a *lingua franca*, although it appears to this worker that an apter characterization would be what also applies to English, i.e. "language of wider communication", with a number of national varieties throughout the world, as well as lower-order dialects.

Likewise, sociolinguistics has been relatively little developed, with the exception of efforts by a few scholars such as Uribe Villegas (1970), who heads the Sociolinguistic Project (Proyecto Sociolingüístico) of the Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales of the National University of Mexico, and which deals with linguistic problems of Indian groups, also involving younger scholars such as Georgina Paulín de Siade, at the same institution. An example of the sort of research needed is examplified by a project undertaken a few years ago, under the joint auspices of the Association for the Inter-American Program in Linguistics and Language Teaching (PILEI) and the Latin American Association for Linguistics and Philology (ALFAL) and the Instituto de Cultura Hispánica in Madrid. An international team including Juan Lope Blanch in Mexico City, Joseph Matluck at the University of Texas at Austin, Humberto López-Morales at Rice University, Houston, Texas, has begun to investigate different styles in such major cities of the Hispanic world, as Caracas, Venezuela; San Juan, Puerto Rico, and Mexico City. Mention should be made as well of sociolinguistic activity at the San Marcos University (Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos) in Lima, Peru, where both United States and Peruvian scholars have for about a half dozen years been involved in that government's Plan for Linguistic Development (Plan de Fomento Lingüístico), aimed at providing for bilingual education both in Spanish and Quechua, as well as other native languages.

In attempting to elaborate the present system, the writer found himself constantly in danger of extending the parameters to the point that it might become overly comprehensive and cumbersome. One such parameter, almost eliminated, was that of what we decided to term "performance mode", referring to the manner of production or delivery. Recognizing that this does intersect with the surface realization of language, James Harris (1969: 7-9), in his recent transformational treatise of Spanish phonology, divides delivery modes into "largo" very slow, "andante" moderately slow but still natural, "allegretto" moderately casual, and "presto" as fast and completely unguarded. He declares that lacking such a guide as Kenyon and Knott's *Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*, he decided instead to base his study on the speech of "a few Mexican friends

whose speech I believe to be typical of educated speakers from Mexico City", and limiting himself mostly to the "andante" or moderately slow and "allegretto" or moderately fast, but with mention of "largo" and "presto", whenever pertinent. Indeed certain performance factors deserve commentary in any discussion of variability, and the above is an example of how a linguist attempted to « mark » that of speed. In our schema, shown further below, some attempt is made to account for performance or realization factors.

At any rate, a small number of scholars are beginning to address themselves to various aspects of acceptability and standardness as regards Spanish.

Jerry R. Craddock of the University of California, Berkeley (1972), in his lexical analysis of several corpuses of Mexican-American Spanish, within this University's Sociclinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism, sets up the following categories: (1) assimilation, (2) blends, and (3) semantic displacement, each with more detailed subdivisions. Addressing himself to the problems involved in enterprises of this sort, he declares:

> "... it is well known that the greatest shortcoming of almost all dictionaries lies in the abstractness of their definitions; there is at present no feasible way to designate the full range of permissible usage (i.e., syntactic environments)... Even though the field worker must rely to a certain extent on the reactions of native speakers, he soon discovers a rather broad area of latitude or indecision that often leaves the question of well-formedness in abeyance."

The general tenor of his statement, we feel, is applicable well beyond lexical issues.

Recently Ornstein (1973) proposed a taxonomy for classifying nonstandard phonological, grammatical and other variants, based on four dimensions, each with two binary or diametrically opposed possibilities.

At this juncture, our proposed notational system is offered immediately below, in the hopes that, through discussion by colleagues, it may become increasingly applicable to language situations throughout the world:

A TENTATIVE SOCIOLINGUISTIC NOTATIONAL SYSTEM [2]

SYMBOL	EXPLANATION	MARKEDNESS
ST	standard	—
fo	formal prescriptive, normative, often of "school variety", careful, deliberate	±
sa	sanctioned by recognized authority (academy, etc.)	±
na	national	±
of	official	±
ac	acrolect(al), higher prestige variety [3]	±
sti	stilted	+
NO	nonstandard	+
ar	argot, slang, caló, jargon, patois, "street variety" [4]	+
ba	basilect(al), lower prestige, positively stigmatized	+
cd	contactual or bilingual dialect [5], interferential variety	+

[2] It would be impossible within this compass to enumerate all possible influences contributing to the devising of this phonemic inventory, except where adoption of a term or concept calls for this. A number of the terms obviously have long been in use in our field, although even here different nuances of usage by linguists are regrettably too vast a topic for our scope. It is mostly in its aspiration to a discrete system that the notational inventory may have merit, and even then it needs further refining.

[3] The term "acrolect" and its opposite "basilect" have been contributed by Stewart (1968).

[4] "Street variety" was suggested to me by Charles G. Elerick, of this University (Ornstein 1971:357).

[5] "Contactual dialect" was coined by Haugen (1971), although he had previously suggested "bilingual dialect" (1969:72; 370-71).

SYMBOL	EXPLANATION	MARKEDNESS
if	interferental feature[6], not necessarily assimilated within bilingual community	+
af	assimilated feature[7], integrated within bilingual community	+
bl	blend, feature or item combining inputs from two or more languages or dialects	+
lo	loan feature or item[8]	±
ss	semantic shift, feature or item revealing change in meaning from ST language	+
ru	rustic, rural	+
hy	hypercorrect, to point of non-standardness	+
NE	neutral	± or ——
la	language	+
di	dialect(al)	±
le	lect of "isolect" (replacing dialect?)[9]	±
va	variety	±
ve	vernacular, "unmonitored" styles of speech[10]	±
cr	creole	±
pi	pidgin	±
st	style, code, register. Write: st + (*designation*)	±
re	regional, geographically determined. Write first 2 letters of country or region, first 3 of *la* or *di*, e. g. FR = France, FRE = French	±
so	social (as in "social dialect")	±
sc	specialized code, e. g., teenagers, occupational	±
hf	high-frequency item	±
lf	low-frequency feature or item	±
un	unstable, fluctuating, neologistic, disappearing, etc.	±
su	status uncertain, lacking further data	+ or ——
ch	changing, shifting, indicate direction with arrow ↔	±
vu	vulgar	±
po	pornographic, obscene, scatological	±
jo	jocose, "wordplay" (transposed phonotactics, etc.; e. g. Pig Latin)	±
arc	archaic	±
ob	obsolete or obsolescent	±
qu–	quasi	±
SES	socioeconomic status. Write: SES + (*designation*)	——
ag	age group. Write: ag + (*designation*)	——
se	sex. Write: se + (*designation*)	——
co	context. Write: co + (*designation*)	——
RM	realization or performance modes and factors	——
or	(principally) oral usage	——
wr	(principally) written usage	——
sp	speed of delivery. Write: sp + (*designation*)	——
gr	graphemically, i.e., "realized in conventional orthography as". Write: gr + (*item*)	——

[6] The dichotomy of "interferential" versus "integrated" loans within a bilingual speech community is a concept of Mackey (1962). Nevertheless, rather than "integrated", we have adopted the term "assimilated", following Craddock (1972).

[7] The term *af* "assimilated feature" as well as *bl* "blend", was adopted from Craddock (1972) in his taxonomy of Southwest Spanish lexicon.

[8] The writer has wished to go beyond the merely lexical suggestivity of Haugen's "loanword" and "loanshift" (Haugen, 1956:55 ff); hence preferring *lo* "loan feature" and *ss* "semantic shift".

[9] C. J. Bailey, Georgetown University, proposes that since "dialect" is unacceptable to so many, it be replaced by "isolect", which is G. B. Milner's term or merely "lect", apparently first used by him and A. A. Afendras (Bailey, 1971, *passim*), Bailey (personal communication, 1972), has recently established the Anglolectal Institute (1720 Que St., Washington, D. C.) for the study of English language variation.

[10] Labov defines vernacular as "the style in which the minimum attention is given to the monitoring of speech." (1970:46 ff).

A few observations of the above system, whose use will be briefly illustrated in our following section, ought to suffice. First of all, as will have been noted, the pattern followed is for the most part a digraphemic one, representing either the first two letters of a one-word term, or the first letter of a two-word term. This has almost inevitably had to be waived in certain cases where this pattern would have led to ambiguity and a triliteral solution was sought, as in interferrential" in which recourse was had by the writer by seeking a second letter further in the word with some phonological suggestivity. In the case of socioeconomic status, "SES" is already widely in use in the social sciences.

Aside from this, the inventory of items admittedly does include several dimensions, which like sociolinguistics itself, intersect with other areas. It is also longer than was anticipated originally, and would doubtless benefit by reduction, but only after further feedback from colleagues is received. The ideal would, of course, be a common and international acceptance of this or a system with the same aims, which might be submitted to the proper entities concerned with standardization of international terminology.

Finally, in the above connection, modern technology might also be brought into play to help record very significant changes of status of the components of human languages, particularly concerning vernacular styles. Lenders (1971) has, for example, expressed his dissatisfaction with the "static" nature of most lexicons, and suggests instead "dynamic" ones, which never assume final form. These would exist only on magnetic tapes or discs, and change constantly according to varying linguistic contexts or for our purpose, determinations of status. He cites as a model the "cumulative dictionary" being developed at the Institute for Communications Research and Phonetics at the University of Bonn. The same could be done for grammar and syntax, in an attempt to describe the sociolinguistic constraints upon its rules.

D. *Accounting for Variants at Different Level · Applying the Notational System.*

In the subsequent portion of this essay, we shall apply our tentative marking system, through a limited number of examples, proceeding inversely from higher to lower levels of analysis:

I. THE CLAUSE

A pair of high-frequency variants may be seen in the existential clause type, of which the standard, formal construction in non-present analogs is unique, because the Predicate is always a 3rd person singular form of *haber* "to have, there to be". Thus

(1) (S, fo) *Había* *muchos hombres* *allí.*
Pr_{exist} + Nom Comp ± Loc

"There were many men there".

In the above, then, we have an existential Predicate, followed by a Nominal Complement [11], and an optional and peripheral locative. Actually, no symbol for "stan-

[11] We are not suggesting that Nominal Complement would be a tagmeme in a definitive grammar, but are merely avoiding its classification as a subject or object.

dard" would always be necessary since this should be taken for granted unless one wishes to contrast several possibilities.

An alternate form also exists which is so widespread in the Spanish-speaking world that it can be classified as "Standard informal" and might be analyzed as:

(2) (S, in) *Habían* *muchos hombres* *allí.*
$Pr_{intr\,(x)}$ + Subj pl ± Loc

or: "Predicate intransitive, subscript x for variation or variant, plus Subject, plural, plus peripheral locative". We would add that the latter represents a different allosyntagma of intransitive clause type because the Subject must follow the Predicate. This, moreover, resembles such constructions in Spanish as:

and { *Sobraban muchos hombres.* "There were many men to spare".
{ *Faltaban muchos hombres.* "Many men were lacking".

but is different because the latter can be constructed with an Indirect Object, impossible in the former. Blansitt (1970) has termed such a construction of "semitransitive" type.

The above example presented few problems since the informal variant was of very high frequency, apparently cutting across all socioeconomic strata of speakers, geographic localities, and most conversational situations. Both members of the variable pair were in effect variants along a continuum or axis of standardness.

The next example is also offered at the clause level where, up until recently at least, tagmemicists have appeared to prefer to function, although as has been noted above, vigorous interest is now being evinced in the higher levels of paragraph and discourse.

Although normative texts in Mexico (there are virtually no others!) generally teach the Peninsular Spanish constructions, which requires the preposition *con*:

(3) (S, fo, SP) *José* *sueña* *con* *su* *casa*
Subj + Pr_x + *con* + Nom. Comp.

"José dreams of his home".

almost exclusively, the following is employed:

(4) (S, in, hf, ME) *José* *sueña su casa*
Subj + Pr_{tr} + DO

"José dreams of his house".

Usage studies are needed, of course, to give something more than impressionistic notions of the distributions of the usage of the two alternatives, but we can hypothesize fairly safely that the prescriptive Peninsular form is limited to schoolroom and stilted employment by hyper-normatively minded individuals, including some teachers and persons with ultra-traditional attitudes toward "correctness".

At any rate, analysis of the above would reveal that both of these constructions can be unequivocally assigned to the *unitransitive* clause type, without setting up a new category. The variant can furthermore be accounted for in the lexicon and with appropriate sociolinguistic markings. Thus:

Unitr., CL = + Subj. + Pred. + DO

(3) (S, fo, SP) *José sueña con su casa.*

(4) (S, in, ME) *José sueña su casa.*

As we have suggested in the lexicon the listing might be something like: (S, fo, SPA) *soñar con*; (S. MEX) *soñar*, with continuing additions from, hopefully, an international team of contributors who would supplement the listings according to geographical and socioeconomic status, insofar as this might be possible.

An alternate solution, nevertheless, would be to establish an additional unitransitive clause allosyntagma, as follows:

Unitr., CL_2: + Subj. ± Pred. + DO_2
DO_2 = con + NP

so that the variant, more infrequent for Mexican speakers, consists of the preposition *con* plus the noun phrase *su casa*. An objection to this, however, is that this would require a proliferation of subclasses of DO and of unitransitive predicate.

II. PHRASE LEVEL STRUCTURES

A single example ought to suffice, here again taken from Mexican usage and apparently not uncommon in Guatemala and other Central American countries:

(5) (S, fo, SP) *un poco de agua*
"a little water"

The more common variant, in the majority of styles would, however, be:

(6) (S, in, ME) *una poca de agua*

It ought to be remarked here that the very shape of the quantifier violates a constraint of prescriptive grammar. The form would be "unacceptable" and lacking well-formedness to highly prescriptive Mexican speakers. At any rate, this seems to us yet another instance of the importance of noting variants which are often indicators of changes which have found the widest currency, but which may still lack formal sanction, particularly for written styles. For such cases "Standard informal", accompanied by geographical notation, ought to be helpful nomenclature for observers of synchronic change in languages.

In any event, our analysis is as follows:

(5) (S, fo, SP) Det + Quant + Prep ($N_{x\ 1\text{-}m}$)
x1 x masc de

(6) (S, in, ME) Det + Quant + Prep ($N_{x\ fem}$)
x2 x fem de
una poca

The second alternative, therefore, shows a constraint in its use in that it must be followed by a feminine head noun, otherwise, the first construction would be em-

ployed. Hence for masculine head nouns, as far as we know, there is no sociolinguistic regional or social variation in Mexican usage.

It might be commented as well, that the construction of (5) and (6) is structurally a phrase although its typical use is only as an included or backlooping phrase in a host Noun Phrase. Moreover, the use of subscripts employing well-known grammatical and linguistic abbreviations necessitates no additions to our notational system which we would prefer to reduce rather than amplify.

III. WORD LEVEL

Classical tagmemicists, at least up to the present, have been almost exclusively concerned with structure, taking meaning for granted, as it were, as part of the grammar, or more specifically, an underlying component of grammar. Nevertheless, there are implications in our present writing for the word level.

Let us first take an example from the morphology of the verb, and in this instance the second person singular familiar of the preterit or simple past. Here we are in the presence of two additional variants, making, with the base standard form, a total of three sociolinguistic choices for the individual generating Spanish utterances. At least in Mexico and the U. S. Southwest, which for the most part form a single speech community, there are present in such a second conjugation verb as *comer* "to eat", the following:

(7) (ST, fo) (gr) (*tú*) *comiste* "You ate"

(8) (qu-St, in, hf) (gr) " *comistes* " "

(9) (NO, ba, SES-L) (gr) " *comites* " "

In the above, example (8) is so widespread throughout the entire Spanish-speaking world, that it lacks all but official sanction to be considered an informal standard variant. A proof of this is that even among persons of considerable higher education, there is uncertainty whether this or (7) are the normative forms. In (9), nevertheless, almost no one would disagree that the form is nonstandard, basilectal, used by speakers of lower socioeconomic status. Actually however, it is not even necessary to indicate the socioeconomic class in this case, since basilects are employed mostly by lower status groups.

Accordingly, we present our total analysis, in which Di Pietro (1963) is followed in the formulation of verb morphology:

Stem +	*Tense and Mood Marker*	*Person Marker*
komí	ste	Ø
komí	ste	s
komí	te	s

Another illustration of possible application of our system might be a Mexican-Spanish variant for such forms as *Siéntense* "Sit down!", the second person plural imperative, when used reflexively in the third person plural, and which is morphologically a third person present subjunctive. This is *Siéntensen* "Sit down!", reflecting a tautological, probably analogical repetition of the personal pronoun marker,

or the final *n* of *sienten* "seat!", when this is followed by the reflexive pronoun *se* "yourselves". Hence:

(10) (ST, fo) *siénten / se*
Verb imper Refl pron

(11) (NO, ba, US $_{sw}$, ME) *siénten /se /n*
Verb imper Refl pron Person marker

A similar type of reduplication occurs in Ecuador, but one apparently not stigmatized and of such high frequency as to qualify at least for quasi-standard status. It is seen in the familiar future tense, in the environment of a following reflexive pronoun marker, a syntactic arrangement, moreover, not permitted in the ST Spanish of Spain, and a good deal if not most of the Hispanic world. At any rate, this may be seen, for example in *sentarastes* "You will sit down", rather than the more common ST in Spanish-speaking countries: *siéntate* "sit down!" an imperative. Hence

(12) (qu-ST, fo, EC) *senta/ ra /s /te*
Root Tense & Mood Marker PM Refl pron

(13) (NO, in, hf, ED) *senta/ ra /s /te /s*
Root Tense & Mood Marker PM Refl pron PM_2

Although lexical markings are no novelty, particularly in dictionaries, their use in the framework presented here would seem to add some sociolinguistic dimensions normally taken for granted. Such a stigmatized noun as *pader* "wall", a metathesized reflex of standard *pared*, common apparently throughout the entire Hispanic world, might be treated lexically as separate entries, cross-referenced to one another, or merely as variants for the same equivalent:

(14) (NO, ba, hf) *pader* ~ (ST, fo) *pared* 'wall'

In the above, one takes the standard as base, although this is merely one way of handling it, and lexicons must respond to their own special needs.

Turning finally to the speech area where the writer and colleagues are studying the Spanish and English bilingual dialects of Mexican-Americans, as well as the Spanish of the immediately adjacent Mexican borderland, a system like ours appears to be particularly applicable. This is, of course, no different than similar contact situations, and the low-prestige status of the contactual dialects has discouraged scholarly treatment and analysis of the potentially available corpuses.

Several items will now be treated which have been gleaned from research within the framework of our University's Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism:

(15) (ST, na, ME; di, US_{sw}) *camión* "bus"

In the above, the point is that rather than *autobús*, the standard equivalent employed in Spain and elsewhere, the Mexican national term is *camión*, serving also for the U. S. Southwest, where we may consider it dialectal. One of the main reasons for the latter decision, oddly enough, is that for both monolingual and bilingual learners of Spanish in this region, schools have almost exclusively em-

ployed texts reflecting Peninsular Spanish for structure and vocabulary, even though phonology has followed Spanish American patterns, so that regional phenomena have not found formal acceptance. The next item is:

(16) (qu-ST, inf, ME, di, US_{sw}) *droga* "debt"

which despite its high-frequency, still appears to be a dialectalism although hardly at all stigmatized.

Our next example reflects a meaning shift, a common result of intensive language contact:

(17) (NO, cd, ss, hf, US_{sw}, SPA ← Eng. *attend*) *atender* "to attend"

which can be rewritten as: nonstandard Spanish, contactual dialect, reshaped morphophonemically to be congruent with the Spanish conjugational system under obvious influence of structural cognate similarity, and with semantic shift. A more complex case is

(18) (NO, cd, ss, jo?, su, US_{sw}, SPA ← Eng. *grocer*) *grosero* "grocery man"

The above differs from (17) in that there is reasonable doubt concerning the status of this item, hence "status uncertain", in part because it appears to be used humorously by some, while to others, it is employed with all seriousness. It needs to be explained here that in ST Spanish *grosero* = "vulgar"

The universals of interference resulting from extensive language contact remain to be systematically studied and ordered. One of the most persistent phenomena is, of course, the mixing which occurs, some of which is productive of new items or features, and some of it merely ephemeral. Hence:

(19) (NO, cd, bl, if, su, US_{sw}, SPA ← Eng. *advantage* + SPA *ventaja*) *adventaja* "advantage"

In the above, gleaned from one Mexican-American informant's written composition, it is not certain whether this was idiolectal or whether it might have been a one-time occurrence, with little likelihood of repetition by that same individual, hence the apparent usefulness if appears to us, both of *if*, "interferential feature", and of *su* "status uncertain" designations.

The impact of American English technical terminology, of mass consumer products, as well as specialized social institutions is, naturally, overwhelming in certain domains. Although a few miles from El Paso, across the U. S. / Mexican border a ST SPA term *parabrisas* is available, the following is almost exclusively heard here:

(20) (NO, cd, lo, af, US_{sw}, SPA /*winšil*/ "windshield"

in which, it goes without saying, rephonemicization occurs, with consonant cluster reduction, shortening of vowel length and the like.

Similarly, one observes:

(21) (NO, cd, lo, af, US_{sw}, SPA /*suera*/ "sweater"

where virtually the same remarks apply, except that the alveolar flap /t/ is realized

with a similar Spanish flap /r/. May it be noted, also that in Spain itself, the equivalent tends to be */xersi/* (gr. Jersey) and less commonly *suéter*, listed in many dictionaries as the ST term also in the Mexico City area. Students writing compositions in Spanish classes here realize the word either as *suera* or *sweater*.

Another type of loan item, however, is that one where, although some sort of ST SPA equivalent may exist or a translation could be rendered, the results would impede rather than facilitate communication in the bilingual speech community. Accordingly:

(22) (ST, lo, af, US_{sw}, SPA) School Board

In this instance, without touching upon the different phonological realizations dependent upon the speaker's English competence, it is almost superfluous to insist that a translation such as "*Consejo de ciudadanos para las escuelas públicas*" ("Committee of Citizens for Public Schools"), would fail the test of intelligibility and usefulness alike. As a result, this must be considered a ST loan.

Understandably, professional communicators such as Mexican-American politicians, announcers, and salesmen, often opt for NO items even if they know the ST perfectly well, to avoid unnecessary distance between themselves and their interlocutors.

At this point, let us address ourselves to one of the thorniest problems in American Spanish, represented by the status of the Pachuco argot. This developed about the time of World War II as a secret code among youthful El Paso deviant elements, but by now much if not most of its colorful lexical content has undergone diffusion into informal styles of Southwest Spanish (and has to some extent in Mexico) among younger males as active, among females as passive idiolectal components of linguistic repertoires. A few examples are offered:

(23) (NO, ar-Pachuco, ba, se-M, US_{sw}, ME, PA) *ranfla* "auto, car, jalopy"

(24) (NO, ar-Pachuco co-peers, US_{sw}, ME) *refinar* "to eat"

It should not be necessary, particularly where a series of related items are presented within the same compass, to include all possible markings since many are so implicational that it is superfluous. Rather do we recommend that different symbols be inserted as one goes along, so that the total picture will become clear. In the above, for instance, we chose to include the peer-group context in which this stigmatized item would be used, since in many Mexican-American families use of such a term would be strictly taboo in the presence of parents and elders. The final item, slightly different in status is:

(25) (NO, ar-Pachuco, su, US_{sw}, ME) *huisa* "girl, gal"

The item, it appears, is fluctuating in usage, unknown to many teenage speakers. Manuel Pacheco, University of Colorado, a native New Mexican (conversation, 1972), notes the term to be widespread in the New Mexican Spanish dialect. It should be pointed out that in the Southwest, two major dialects exist. (cf. Ornstein, 1970, for discussion of Southwest Spanish Koine vs. New Mexico-Southern Colorado variety).

Not wishing to slight phonology, we take example of a high-frequency variant of /č/ (gr. *ch*) in Southwest Spanish and occurring in other parts of the Hispanic world:

(26) (NO, cd, hf, ba, SPA, US_{sw}, ME, PA) *mušaša* ~ (ST, fo SES-higher st-careful, SPA, US_{sw}, ME, PA) *mučača muchacha* "girl"

In this example, we are signalling that in the U.S. Southwest, Mexico and Panama, both realizations occur with differentiation being by socioeconomic factors. The right-hand "standard" pronunciation is largely limited to upper-strata speakers, and even here mostly in careful style. For the majority of speakers of the Mexican-American contactual dialect, however, the left-hand pronunciation is the norm, albeit quite stigmatized. For them, change has already taken place.

An example particularly apt for reflecting synchronic changes is taken from Argentinian Spanish, where a shift of the voiced lamino-palatal groove sibilant /ž/ is occurring to the voiceless /š/ counterpart, particularly among younger generation speakers.

(27) (ST, hf, ag-younger, AR, SPA) *kaše* ← (ST, ch, ag-older, AR, SPA)
kaže *calle* "street"

Finally, our system would appear to be particularly applicable wherever large-scale changes are in process, as for example Danish, in which virtually the entire vocalic system is undergoing a shift toward openness.

(28) (ST, DAN) *venə* ← (qu-ST, ch, ofa, hy, sti, lf, ag-older, DAN)
vinə *vinde* "to gain, win"

Thus it is indicated that the latter realization is so old-fashioned, stilted and hypercorrect as to qualify it for quasi-standard status at best. Whatever may be the shortcomings of this tentative system, in conclusion, enough has been presented to suggest that it may exhibit the potential of providing a great deal of both linguistic and extra-linguistic information needed to interpret changes in process and their direction.

E. *Some Implications.*

Work on this paper and related activity of the Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism at this writer's university, indicate strongly that divergence appears to occur infinitely more frequently at the lower tagmemic levels, and particularly at the level of the phrase and word. It is not accidental, therefore, that interference studies have tended to focus on the lexicon. At the same time, it is also true that very little has been done to ascertain what are the universals of bilingual and bidialectal contact behavior. Can one identify some of the apparent conditions which bring about variants, and what is the role of bilingual or bidialectal contact?

Another problem is the relationship of variance in surface forms to the processes of linguistic change. What are the factors that favor the emergence of one form over another, aside from the prescriptive force of sociopolitical considerations? How can one explain seemingly capricious disappearances of high-frequency forms in favor of low-frequency ones? Similarly does semological change, particularly in the lexicon, follow "universal" tendencies emic in nature, rather than etic?

It appears to us that whatever the model used, be it tagmemic or otherwise, an urgent need exists for notational systems which will delineate the sociolinguistic constraints on the use of varying and competing language forms. These ought to help analyze tendencies in the processes of change far better than the retrospective

and intuitive approaches still predominant today.

Moreover, it occurs to us that one of the stumbling blocks to analyzing synchronic (and even diachronic) changes has been the tendency to concentrate upon unitary forms, and the failure to flag or indicate variants which, outside of strongly formal and normative contexts, are actually of much higher frequency than the less prestigious ones. Thus, in a way, linguistic corpuses have assumed the shapes of rather artificial and idealized masses of bodies of "data", which are intended more for the convenience of the analyst than for revealing the realities of language usage.

New linguistic vistas, it would seem to us, are now opening before us, as the relatively unexplored potential of bilingual and bidialectal corpuses become valid and respectable objects of scholarly investigations. Not a sociolinguist, but an eminent scholar of Sanskrit and general linguistics, Emeneau has commented (1962 : 42):

> "'Language mixture', i.e., structural borrowing is not a monstrosity or an impossibility. It occurs. There is surely much more evidence of it to be recognized and added to the small amount of certain instances that we may now operate with. To be sure, the only really valid evidence is that derived from bilingual situations in which the languages on both sides are well known. It will not do to deal in substrata that have long vanished entirely from our control".

Finally, it appears hard to dispute that one of the best ways of counteracting the unitary bias, is to incorporate more sociolinguistic data about linguistic phenomena, through systems of marking. These hopefully might even gain international acceptance and facilitate research by multi-national scholarly teams.

University of Texas, El Paso

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, Charles-James N. 1970. « The Integration of Linguistic Theory: Internal Reconstruction and the Comparative Method in Descriptive Linguistics ». (Univ. of Hawaii, Dept. of Linguistics. Working Papers in Linguistics, 2:93-102. July). Forthcoming in R. P. Stockwell, ed., *Historical Linguistics in the Perspective of Generative Grammar*. Indiana Univ. Press.

— —. 1971. *Variation and Language Theory*. (Unpublished monograph presented at Summer Institute of LSA, 1971, SUNY-Buffalo, July 20-23 in Advanced Survey of Contemporary Issues in Sociolinguistics).

Baratz, Joan C. 1970. « Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System ». In *Language and Poverty. Perspectives on a Theme*. Frederick Williams, ed., Chicago, Markham Publishing Co., 11-24.

Bernstein, Basil. 1970. « A Sociolinguistic Approach to Socialization: with Some Reference to Educability ». In *Language and Poverty*. Williams, ed., 25-61.

Bishop, Morris. 1969. « Good Usage, Bad Usage and Usage ». In *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Wm. Morris, ed., New York, American Heritage Publishing Co. and Houghton Mifflin, xxi-xxiv.

Blansitt, Edward L., Jr. « Introductory Remarks ». In Report on the Eighteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. E. L. Blansitt, Jr., ed. Washington, D. C., Georgetown Univ. Press, 11-12.

— —, and Jacob Ornstein. 1969. « Tagmemics and String Grammar ». *Anthropological Linguistics*. 11 (June): 67-76.

— —. 1967. « Sentence and Clause in Universal Grammar ». *Anthropological Linguistics*. 12 (April): 112-21.

— —. 1972. « Cognitive Tagmemics ». *Linguistics*. 104:5-14.

Boyd-Bowman, Peter. 1970. Review of Sebeok *Current Trends in Linguistics IV*. *Language*. 46: 189-92.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Coates, William A. 1966. « A Framework for the Description of Linguistic Behavior Episodes ». *Linguistics*. 27: 26-48.

Cook, Walter A. 1964. *On Tagmemes and Transforms*. Washington, D. C., Georgetown Univ., Press.

Craddock, Jerry R. 1972. *Lexical Analysis of Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism (SSSB) Bilingual Corpuses: Dialectal Traits and Chief Interference Patterns*. Monograph prepared for The Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center, University of Texas, El Paso.

De Camp, David. 1970. « Is a Sociolinguistic Theory Possible ». In *Linguistics and Teaching of Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages or Dialects*. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics: 20th Annual Round Table. No. 22, J. A. Alatis, ed., Wash., D. C., Georgetown Univ. Press, 157-74.

Diebold, A. Richard, Jr. 1962. « Mexican and Guatemalan Bilingualism ». In *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa and Latin America*. Frank A. Rice, ed., Wash., D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 26-33.

Di Pietro, Robert J. 1963. « Morphemic Analysis of the Spanish Verb ». *Filología Moderna*. 13 (Oct.): 53-58.

Emeneau, M. B. 1962. « Bilingualism and Structural Borrowing ». *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 106 (Oct.): 430-42.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1968. « An Analysis of the Interaction of Languages Topic and Listener ». In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. J. A. Fishman, ed., The Hague, Mouton, 192-211.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1970. « Two Models of Socially Significant Variation ». *Language*. 46: 551-73.

— —. 1971. « Minding Your Z's and D's. Distinguishing Syntactic and Phonological Variable Rules ». *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1962. « The Language Factor in National Development ». In *Study of the Role of Second Languages*. Rice, ed., 8-14. *Ibid*. 1-7.

— —. 1959. « Diglossia ». *Word*. 15: 325-40.

Fernández Naranjo, Nicolás and Dora Gómez de Fernández. 1967. *Diccionario de bolivianismos*. 2nd ed., La Paz, Bolivia, Editorial, « Los Amigos del Libro ».

Fishman, Joshua A. 1970. *Sociolinguistics. A Brief Introduction*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House, 37-56.

— —, Robert L. Cooper and Roxana Ma. 1968. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. (No. OEC-1-7-0628-17-0279) Wash., D. C., Office of Education.

— —, C. A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta, eds. 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York, John Wiley.

Fries, Charles C. and Kenneth L. Pike. 1949. « Coexistent Phonemic Systems ». *Language* 25: 29-50.

Fries, Peter. 1971. « Review of W. A. Cook *Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis* ». *Language Sciences* 17 (Oct.): 45-50.

— —. 1972. « Tagmemics ». In *Language: Introductory Readings*. Clark, Eschholz and Rosa, eds., New York, St. Martin's Press.

— —. (forthcoming) « Problems in the Description of the English Noun Phrase ». Paper prepared for the 11th International Congress of Linguists, Bologna, 1972.

García, Erica. 1968. « Spanish Phonology ». In *Current Trends in Linguistics IV: Ibero-American and Caribbean Linguistics*. T. A. Sebeok, ed., The Hague, Mouton, 63-83.

Garfinkel, H. 1968. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, Erving. 1972. *Relations in Public Microstudies in Public Order*. New York, Basic Books.

Guitarte, Guillermo L. and Rafael Torres Quintero. 1968. « Linguistic Correctness and the Role of the Academies ». In *Current Trends in Linguistics*. Sebeok, ed., 562-604.

Gumperz, John J. 1967. « Linguistic Repertoires, Grammar and Second Language Instruction ». In *Report of the 16th Round Table Meeting* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 18) C. W. Kreidler, ed., Wash., D. C., Georgetown Univ. Press, 81-90.

— —. 1969. « Communication in Multilingual Societies ». In *Cognitive Anthropology*. S. A. Tyler, ed., N. Y., Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 435-49.

Halliday, Michael A. K., Angus McIntosh and Peter Strevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press.

Harris, James, 1969. *Spanish Phonology*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1956. *Bilingualism in the Americas*. University, Univ. of Alabama Press.

— —. 1969. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Second Edition. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press.

— —. 1971. « The Ecology of Language ». *Linguistic Reporter*. Supplement 25, (Winter). 19-26.

— —. (forthcoming) « Bilingualism, Language Contact and Immigrant Languages in the U. S.: A Research Report 1956-70 ». To appear in *Current Trends in Linguistics: X*. T. A. Sebeok, ed., The Hague, Mouton.

Hill, A. A. 1969. « Review of Quirk and Svartvik *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability* ». *Language*. 45: 622-24.

— —. 1970. « Laymen, Lexicographers and Linguists ». *Language*. 46: 245-58.

Hoss, Norman. 1969. « Guide to the Dictionary ». *The American Heritage Dictionary*. Morris, ed., XLI-XLIX.

Householder, Fred W. 1969. « Review of Langacker *Language and Its Structure* ». *Language*. 45: 886-97.

Hymes, Dell H. 1962. « The Ethnography of Speaking ». In *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. T. Gladwin and W. C. Sturtevant, eds., Wash., D. C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 15-53.

— —. 1967. « Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting ». *Journal of Social Issues*. 23: 8-28.

Ivić, Pavle. 1966. « Discussion of Gumperz' 'On the Ethnology of Linguistic Change' ». In *Sociolinguistics*. Wm. Bright, ed., The Hague, Mouton, 39 ff.

Jakobovits, Leon A. 1971. *Preliminaries to the Psychology of Ordinary Language*. (To appear in W. Brewer and L. A. Jakobovits, eds., *Revolution in Psychological Theory*).

John, Vera P. 1970. « Response to Harry Osser 'Developmental Studies in Communicative Competence' ». In *Sociolinguistics*. Shuy, ed., 31-34.

— —, and Vivian M. Horner. 1970. « Bilingualism and the Spanish-Speaking Child ». In *Language and Poverty*. Williams, ed., 140-52.

Joos, Martin. 1962. *The Five Clocks*. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press.

Labov, William A. 1966. *The Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

— —. 1970. « The Study of Language in its Social Context ». *Studium Generale*. 23: 30-87.

— —, P. Cohen, C. Robins and J. Lewis. 1968. *A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City*. (Coop. Research Project 3288) Wash., D. C., Office of Education.

Lenders, W. 1968. « Static and Dynamic Lexical Systems ». In *Applications of Linguistics, Selected Papers of the 2nd International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge, 1969*. G. E. Perren and J. L. M. Trim, eds., Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 313-17.

Liêm Nguyễn Đăng. 1966. *English Grammar: A Combined Tagmemics and Transformational Approach*. Canberra, Australia: Linguistic Circle of Canberra Publications.

Longacre, Robert E. 1968. *Grammar Discovery Procedures*. The Hague, Mouton.

— —. 1970. « Sentence Structure as a Statement Calculus ». *Language*. 46.

Lope Blanch, Juan M. 1968. « Hispanic Dialectology ». In *Current Trends in Linguistics IV*. Sebeok, ed., 106-57.

Mathiot, Madeleine. 1962. « Noun Classes and Folk Taxonomy in Papago ». *American Anthropologist*. 64: 340-50.

— —. (forthcoming) *An Approach to the Cognitive Study of Language*.

Mackey, William F. 1962. « The Description of Bilingualism ». *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*. 7.

Meyerstein, Zlata. 1970. « Review of Kelly *Description and Measurement of Bilingualism* ». *Language*. 46: 784 ff.

McDavid, Raven. 1971. « Dialect Geography and Social Science Problems ». In *Readings in American Dialectology*. Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood, eds., New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts and Meridith Corp., 357-64.

Newman, Stanley. 1968. « Review of Law *Obligatory Constructions in Isthmus Nahuat Grammar* ». *Language*. 44: 189-91.

Ornstein, Jacob. 1970. « Sociolinguistics and New Perspectives in the Study of Southwest Spanish ». In *Studies in Language and Linguistics 1969-70*. R. W. Ewton, Jr. and J. Ornstein, eds., El Paso: Texas, Western Press, 127-84.

— —. 1971. « Language Varieties Along the U.S.-Mexican Border ». In *Applications of Linguistics*. Perren and Trim, eds., 349-62.

— —. 1973. « Toward a Classification of Southwest Spanish Nonstandard Variants ». (Presented at 32nd Summer Meeting Linguistic Society of America, 1970). *Linguistics*. 93(Dec.): 70-87.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1966. « A Guide to Publications Related to Tagmemic Theory ». In *Current Trends in Linguistics III: Theoretical Foundations*. T. A. Sebeok, ed., The Hague: Mouton, 365-93.

— —. 1960. « Toward a Theory of Change & Bilingualism ». *Studies in Linguistics*. 15: 1-7.

— —. 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of Human Behavior*. The Hague, Mouton.

Quirk, Randolph and Jan Svartvik. 1966. *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability*. The Hague, Mouton.

Rubin, Joan. 1968. *National Bilingualism in Paraguay*. The Hague, Mouton.

Sacks, H. 1969. « The Search for Help ». In *Studies in Social Interaction*. D. Sudnow, ed., New York, MacMillan.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1968. « Sequencing in Conversational Openings ». In *Contributions in Ethnomethodology*. H. Garfinkel and H. Sacks, eds. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Press.

Shuy, Roger W. 1970. « The Sociolinguists and Urban Language Problems ». In *Language and Poverty*. Williams, ed., 335-50.

— —, Walter A. Wolfram and William K. Riley. 1968. *Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study*. Wash., D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Smith, David M. and Roger W. Shuy, eds. 1972. *Sociolinguistics in Cross-Cultural Analysis*. Wash., D. C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Stewart, William A. 1965. « Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English ». In *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. R. W. Shuy, ed., Champaign, Ill., National Council on the Teaching of English, 10-19.

— —. 1968. « A Sociolinguistic Typology Describing National Multilingualism ». In *Reader in the Sociology of Language*. J. A. Fishman, ed., 531-545.

Taylor, Orlando. 1971. « Response to Frederick Williams 'Social Dialects and the Field of Speech' ». In *Sociolinguistics: A Crossdisciplinary Perspective*. Roger W. Shuy, ed., Wash., D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 13-20.

Uribe Villegas, Oscar. 1970. *Sociolingüística. Una introducción a su estudio*. México D. F., Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Von Raffler Engel, Walburga. 1971. « Intonational and Vowel Correlates in Contrasting Dialects ». Presented at VIIth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences. University of Montreal.

— —, and C. K. Seligman. 1971. « Rythm, Narration, Description in the Speech of Black and White School Children ». *Language Sciences*. (Dec.): 9-14.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. New York, Linguistic Circle of New York.

— —, William Labov and M. I. Herzog. 1968. « Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change ». In *Directions for Historical Linguistics*. W. P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, eds., Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 95-195.

Williams, Frederick. 1970. « Language, Attitude and Social Change ». In *Language and Poverty*. Williams, ed., 380-99.

Wolfram, Walter. 1969. *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech*. Wash., D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

— —. 1971. *Overlapping Influence in the English of Second Generation Puerto Rican Teenagers in Harlem*. (with Marie Shiels and Ralph W. Fasold) Office of Education Grant No. 3-70-0033 (508). Wash., D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.